



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Potential impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges and the habitats they form

Citation for published version:

Vad, J, Kazanidis, G, Henry, L-A, Jones, D, Tendall, O, Christiansen, S, Henry, T & Roberts, JM 2018, 'Potential impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges and the habitats they form', *Advances in Marine Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.amb.2018.01.001>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/bs.amb.2018.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.amb.2018.01.001)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Advances in Marine Biology

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Working title of review:

Potential impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges and the habitats they form.

Authors:

J Vad, G Kazanidis, L-A Henry, D Jones, O Tendall, S Christiansen, T Henry, JM Roberts

Target Journal:

Advances in Marine Biology

Figures and tables:

Figure 1: Deep-sea sponge and sponge grounds

Figure 2: Flow chart of oil field development divided in four phases and main activities associated with each phase

Figure 3: Field data on the initial impact and recovery from oil drilling disturbance in deep-sea sponges in the Faroe-Shetland Channel (Laggan; Jones *et al.*, 2012) and Norwegian Sea (Morvin; Gates and Jones, 2012).

Table 1: Vulnerable marine ecosystem (VME) and ecologically and biologically significant area (EBSA) criteria and their applicability to deep-sea sponge grounds

Table 2: Overview of major impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges and deep-sea sponge grounds at community, individual, cellular and molecular levels and throughout oil field development.

ABSTRACT

Sponges may form an important component of benthic ecosystems from shallow littoral to hadal depths. In the deep ocean beyond the continental shelf, sponges can form high-density fields, constituting important habitats supporting rich benthic communities. Yet these habitats remain relatively unexplored. Apart from scientific exploration, the offshore oil and gas industry has played a key role in advancing our knowledge of deep-sea environments. Since its inception in the 1960s, offshore oil and gas industry has moved into deeper waters. However, the impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges and other ecosystems are only starting to become the subject of active research. Throughout the development, operation and closure of an oil or gas field many activities take place, ranging from the seismic exploration of sub-seafloor geological features or the installation of infrastructure at the seabed to the drilling process itself. Accidental releases of hydrocarbons during spills or cuttings release can significantly impact the local marine environment. Each phase of a field development or an accidental oil spill will therefore have different impacts on sponges at community, individual and cellular levels. Legacy issues regarding the future decommissioning of infrastructure and the abandonment of wells are also important environmental management considerations. This paper reviews our understanding of impacts from hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation activities on deep-sea sponges and the habitats they form. Effects of offshore oil and gas activities include (1) at community level, decreasing of the diversity and density of benthic communities associated with deep-sea sponges owing to physical disturbance of the seabed, (2) at individual level, interrupting filtration owing to exposure to increased sedimentation, (3) at cellular level, decreasing in cellular membrane stability owing to exposure to drill muds. However, many potential effects, not yet tested in deep-sea sponges but observed in shallow-water sponges or other model organisms should also be taken into account. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have shown impact

of oil or dispersed oil on deep-sea sponges. To highlight these significant knowledge gaps, a summary table of potential and known impacts of hydrocarbon extraction and production activities, combined with a simple “traffic light” scheme is also provided.

INTRODUCTION

Presently, offshore oil and gas production accounts for one third of worldwide hydrocarbons production (Benneer 2015). Since the end of the 1960s and the beginning of offshore oil and gas exploration, the oil and gas industry have developed technologies that enable exploitation of deep-sea environments (Managi *et al.* 2005) and is, today, operating in deeper and complex marine settings (Muehlenbachs *et al.* 2013). Hydrocarbon exploration and production is taking place in areas where vulnerable benthic species such as deep-sea sponges are present. For example, in the Faroe-Shetland Channel, oil production activities are taking place within a Nature Conservation Marine Protected Area designated to protect the local deep-sea sponge grounds (Henry and Roberts, 2014).

Exploration for hydrocarbon and other resources in deep waters offshore has helped discover new deep-sea environments. For example, collaborative efforts between academia and industry partners have been very successful in increasing our understanding of deep-sea benthic ecosystems e.g. the SERPENT project (Scientific and Environmental ROV Partnership using Existing iNdustry Technology) (Gates *et al.* 2016) and discovering previously unknown habitats such as the Darwin Mounds in the NE Atlantic (Huvenne *et al.* 2016). However, industrial operations in deeper settings are strongly correlated with a number of technical incidents such as blowouts, injuries or spills (Muehlenbachs *et al.* 2013) as well as operational discharges and disturbances leading to the chemical contamination of water and seafloor habitats as well as local scale physical impacts from amongst others drilling, anchoring and pipelines (OSPAR Commission 2009a). This was most starkly

demonstrated by the 2010 *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, caused by a well blowout at 1500 m depth (Beyer et al. 2016 and references therein). Subsea well blowouts and pipeline leaks at depth have become more of a concern while the number of tanker-related oil incidents at surface have decreased over time (Jernelöv 2010). In addition, day to day operations can also have environmental impacts in the deep sea (Cordes *et al.* 2016). From the presence of man-made infrastructures on the seabed to the release of produced waters or the re-sedimentation of particles close to the drilling locations, the ecological footprints of the offshore oil and gas production activities are multiple (Kark *et al.* 2015). As it is known that recovery rates vary in the deep-sea depending on the region and biological communities already living there, understanding the impact of oil and gas industry related activities on deep-sea benthic ecosystems is complex (Henry *et al.* 2017).

Furthermore, while pressures from anthropogenic activities such as the exploitation of oil and gas reserves on deep-sea ecosystems keep increasing, our understanding of deep-sea organisms and the scale of human impacts on ecosystems functioning remains limited (Ramirez-Llodra *et al.* 2011). Deep-sea ecosystems comprise a highly diverse set of physical and biological settings, many of which are hotspots of biodiversity including hydrothermal vents, abyssal plains, manganese nodule fields, cold-water coral reefs and sponge grounds (Ramirez-Llodra *et al.* 2011). Although many of these ecosystems also contribute significantly in global biogeochemical cycling (Ramirez-Llodra *et al.* 2011) the overall value of the ecosystem services provided by deep-sea ecosystems remain poorly quantified (Thurber *et al.* 2014).

Sponges (Phylum Porifera) play vital roles in sustaining global deep-sea biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. The diversity of sponges in the deep sea (Fig. 1A and B), the rarity of some poriferan taxa (members of the class Calcarea), and the ecological uniqueness of some poriferan groups such as carnivorous sponges of the family Cladorhizidae (Fig. 1C)

and the stalked glass sponges of the family Hyalonematidae, all add to the biological richness of life in the deep ocean (Hogg *et al.* 2010). Habitats formed by dense aggregations of one or several sponge taxa (sponge “grounds”, Fig. 1D) can extend over very large areas up to hundreds of km² and provide three-dimensionally complex stable habitats that support distinct biological communities and a biologically diverse mixture of other species (Maldonado *et al.* 2016). Maldonado *et al.* (2016) provides an extensive review of sponge grounds including deep-sea sponge grounds such as the hexactinellid sponge reefs in the northeast Pacific Ocean off, astrophorid sponge aggregations in the north Atlantic, lithistid sponge grounds or antarctic sponge grounds more than 400 species rich. Sponges themselves host an array of organisms ranging from bryozoans or polychaetes to crustaceans (Wulf 2006; Kazanidis *et al.* 2015) and sponge grounds act as nursery grounds and support many benthic species including commercially important fish species such as rockfish, hake and blue ling (Freese and Wing, 2003; Du Preez and Tunnicliffe 2011; Maldonado *et al.* 2016) (Fig. 1E to H). Therefore, sponge grounds meet several criteria of Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) as recognised by the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). Deep-sea sponge grounds also meet the criteria of Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs) as defined by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (table 1) (Hogg *et al.* 2010).

Despite their ability to enhance benthic biodiversity, the biology and ecology of deep-sea sponges has only started to be uncovered. What has been revealed most recently is that sponges play essential roles in the biogeochemical cycling of matter in the deep oceans (Cathalot *et al.* 2015). This is principally owing to sponges being very efficient at filtering large volumes of water as they rely on Particulate Organic Matter (POM) as well as Dissolved Organic Matter (DOM) for food (Rix *et al.* 2016). Up to 40% of the carbon and nitrogen assimilated by sponges is released back into the water column in the form of

pumping and mesohyl cell detritus (Rix *et al.* 2016). Sponges, including deep-sea species, thus recycle DOM to POM which is then available for other benthic organisms and contributes to benthic-pelagic coupling in oligotrophic environments (Maldonado 2016; Rix *et al.* 2016). Sponges host highly diverse microbial communities of bacteria, archaea and eukaryotes, often compared for their complexity to the microbial assemblages of the mammalian gut (Hentschel *et al.* 2012; Webster *et al.* 2012). Deep-sea sponges participate in nitrogen cycling through these microbial symbionts capable of nitrification, denitrification and ammonia reactions (Hoffman *et al.* 2009; Li *et al.* 2014). The concept of a ‘sponge loop’ have therefore emerged in the literature whereby sponges support oligotrophic food webs by recycling organic carbon and nitrogen (De Goeij *et al.* 2013; Maldonado 2016). Furthermore, sponge skeleton elements (spicules) are composed of silica assimilated from the environment and sponges can play large roles in the cycling of silica. Glass sponge reefs composed of hexactinellid sponges such as *Aphrocallistes vastus*, which are composed of up to 80% of biogenic silica, concentrate huge amounts of Si in some areas of the seabed (Chu *et al.* 2011).

It is also becoming more evident that deep-sea sponges create other ecosystem services: these “provisioning” services including the production of bioactive secondary metabolites related to sponge-microbial associations that are of great interest to the biotechnology sector. Conservation of these ancient animals (individual sponges have been aged over 400 to over 2000 years old) and their habitats must therefore scale up with the rates and extent of emerging anthropogenic activity, and thus the impacts that deep-water oil and gas activities could have on these benthic organisms needs to be considered in management plans (McMurray *et al.* 2008; Fallon *et al.* 2010).

The purpose of this review is to provide the first fully comprehensive review of the impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges and the habitats they create. Although studies on the resilience of deep-sea sponges to some oil and gas production

activities are starting to emerge, many knowledge gaps persist. Relevant findings from shallow-water sponges or other benthic organisms has therefore also been used here to highlight possible impacts on deep-sea sponges and the habitats they form. Impacts can occur at all stages of offshore oil and gas activities from exploration, development and production through to decommissioning and legacy effects. Furthermore, effects of these activities can be detected across ecological scales from community, individual and cellular levels. This review therefore adopts this multiple scale framework to assess impacts at the level of sponge habitats, at the individual sponge level and at the cellular and molecular level.

EFFECT ON SPONGE HABITATS AND COMMUNITIES

During the development of an oil and gas field under development the activities can broadly be broken up into four successive phases: exploration and appraisal, development, production and decommissioning (DTI 2001; Fig. 2). Each phase involves a range of routine activities that may have effects on deep-sea sponge habitats and the biological communities they support (Fig. 2). Exceptional events such as accidental spills and chemical releases could also negatively affect deep-sea sponge grounds and so should also be taken into consideration. Potential impacts of accidental spills are treated separately in this section of the review to help guide the development of monitoring and spill management plans.

Impacts of routine activities on deep-sea sponge grounds and associated communities

Subsea infrastructure (wells, pipelines, manifolds and platforms)

During the phases of exploration and development, offshore oil and gas activities require the drilling of wells and the installations of heavy infrastructure such as manifolds and pipelines that directly disturbs the seabed (Fig. 2). Physical disruption and smothering by sediments is one of the main impacts linked to the early stages of oil field development

arising from installing pipelines, cables, bottom rigs, templates, skids, and platforms including platform legs and anchoring (OSPAR commission 2010). Physical disruption and increased sedimentation (Fig. 1I and J) during these phases can locally diminish benthic communities by more than 90% in terms of megafaunal density within sponge grounds (Jones *et al.* 2006). Long-term effects on deep-sea sponge grounds from such physical disturbance are still detectable up to 10 years post-drilling and this slow, partial recovery, inversely related to the distance to the well and the time after drilling, could result from the long-lived nature, slow growth rates and low reproduction rates of most deep-sea organisms (Jones *et al.* 2012). Very limited recovery of megafauna was observed in areas where drill cuttings were not eroded 10 years post drilling (Jones *et al.* 2012).

Physical disruption and increased sedimentation are also associated with the installation of pipelines, which export produced hydrocarbons onshore. Power transmission cable installations significantly impact local benthic communities inflicting a 100% mortality rates to glass sponges below the cables and a 15% mortality rate within 1.5 m of the cables all along its footpath (Dunham *et al.* 2015) with potentially similar effects expected from pipeline deployments (OSPAR commission 2010).

Discharges of drill cuttings and drill muds

In the early stages of drilling a well drill cuttings and muds, comprising residual rock fragment from the well and drilling fluid chemicals, are released directly into the environment at depth (Ellis *et al.* 2012). For the remainder of the drilling process, treated cuttings are typically discharged at the surface, where they sink to the seafloor under the rig. Unless dispersed by active near-bed currents, drill cuttings can accumulate on the seabed and over time may release contaminants, especially if disturbed (OSPAR commission 2010). The usually customised drill muds can be classified into three types: oil-based, synthetic and

water-based fluids all of which may contain toxic chemicals, including polyaromatic hydrocarbons and heavy metals. Only two studies have shown the impact of drilling mud and cuttings on megafaunal communities with abundant sponges, both in the north east Atlantic (Gate and Jones, 2012; Jones *et al.* 2012). Both studies indicate major reductions in sponge densities and reduced diversity close (100-200 m) to drilling activity that persist for several years (Fig. 3). The gravity of the impact of drill muds and cuttings has been better studied on other benthic communities where the impacts have been shown to depend largely on abiotic conditions such as depth and currents as well as the concentration of chemicals associated with the muds (Ellis *et al.* 2012, Henry *et al.* 2017). For synthetic and water-based muds, a decrease in community diversity and abundance have been measured up to 1,000 m away from the release location (Ellis *et al.* 2012). Functional changes in benthic communities, associated with a loss of suspension-feeding species and an increase in deposit feeders have also been detected at release sites (Trannum *et al.* 2010; Ellis *et al.* 2012). The spatial impact footprint is largest during the first one to two years after drilling and reduces in extent and contaminant concentration afterwards due to leaching into the water column (OSPAR Commission 2016). Today the production and release of oil-based drill muds have been widely reduced in the North East Atlantic by the oil and gas industry (OSPAR Recommendations R2001/1, 2006/5 and 2010/18) but use of oil-based drill muds in the past has been shown to have a local but strong and lasting impact on benthic communities (OSPAR Commission 2010; Henry *et al.* 2017). Potential impacts of past releases of oil-based drill muds on sponge grounds and associated benthic communities therefore still need to be understood.

Decommissioning

As offshore infrastructures age, decommissioning options for the physical removal of

223 oil and gas infrastructure including pipelines, platforms, drill cuttings and the capping of
224 wells needs to be considered (Fig. 2). Worldwide, there are over 7,500 oil and gas structures
225 offshore and about 85% of them will need to be decommissioned by 2025 (Fowler *et al.*
226 2014). In the North East Atlantic, the dumping, and leaving wholly or partly in place, of
227 disused offshore installations has been prohibited within certain sea areas, under OSPAR
228 Decision 98/3 on the Disposal of Disused Offshore Installations since 1998. Based on a pre-
229 defined assessment demonstrating that there are significant reasons why an alternative
230 disposal is preferable to reuse or recycling or final disposal on land, the competent authority
231 of the relevant Contracting Party may authorise companies to leave some parts of the
232 installations in place after consultation with the other Contracting Parties. Such derogations
233 concern very heavy concrete and steel installations which might provide a suitable settlement
234 ground also for deepwater sponges. Until 2009, 122 offshore installations have been brought
235 ashore for disposal and only five permits have been issued for structures to be left in place
236 (OSPAR Commission 2009a). However, with more and more installations approaching their
237 end of life, the industry has started to lobby for a modification of the Decision itself instead
238 of using the derogation options provided by OSPAR Decision 98/3. The argument is that the
239 physical impact on the seabed as well as the economic costs of such operations are
240 substantial.

241 Environmental impacts caused by a complete removal of offshore infrastructure that
242 could negatively affect deep-sea sponge grounds and associated communities may include:
243 contamination of the water column by hydrocarbons and other chemicals, direct damage to
244 the seabed and smothering by increase sedimentation (Fowler *et al.* 2014). Decommissioning
245 of oil and gas industry infrastructure has not yet taken place within known deep-sea sponge
246 grounds and so potential impacts of decommissioning at community level is for the moment
247 unknown. Under UK regulation, decommissioning impacts on the environment must be

considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) produced in the beginning of any new oil and gas field development (DECC, 2011).

Accidental spills and releases

The *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill was one of the largest and deepest offshore oil spills to date, with approximately 3.19 million barrels of oil released into the water at a depth of 1500 m (Beyer *et al.* 2016 and reference therein). It was also the first time dispersants were used to such an extent at depth to mitigate the formation of a surface oil slick that would have impacted upon sensitive coastal ecosystems (White *et al.* 2014). Almost 3 million litres of dispersant Corexit™ 95000 were released near the well head (White *et al.* 2014). A large amount of the oil released into the water column formed several subsurface oil plumes (Diercks *et al.* 2010). The most significant sub-surface plume extended for 35 km at approximately 1100 m depth (Camilli *et al.* 2010). The *DeepWater Horizon* incident thus created a new kind of oil spill where deep water ecosystems and habitats were exposed to high concentrations of dispersed crude oil and dispersants (Peterson *et al.* 2012).

Impact of accidental oil releases are better understood in shallow water than in deep ecosystems. In shallow water coastal environments, oil spills have shown both lethal (high mortality rate) and sub-lethal effects (carcinogenic and cytotoxic impacts) on benthic species leading to changes in community diversity, age structure and trophic interactions (Suchanek 1993). Impact of oil spills on deep-sea benthic ecosystems are far less understood. After the *Deepwater Horizon* incident, significant decreases in macro- and meio-fauna diversity were detected after the blowout up to 17 km away from the well (Montagna *et al.* 2013). Other studies have shown high mortality rate of deep-water corals, colonial and pelagic tunicates, sea pens as well as glass sponges within a 2 km radius of the well but no further result on deep-sea sponges is given (White *et al.* 2012; Valentine and Benfield 2013).

Long-term impacts of oil spills in shallow water ecosystems often take the form of

community structure anomalies (absence of organisms of a specific age class) owing to the longevity and slow growth rate of some species (Kingston 2002). Long-term impacts of deep-sea oil spill such as the *DeepWater Horizon* oil spill remains unknown. Deep-sea sponges display relatively slow and strongly seasonal growth rates varying from a few millimetres to a couple of centimetres per year (Fallon *et al.* 2010; Dayton *et al.* 2013; Dunham *et al.* 2015), suggesting that deep-sea spills in the vicinity of deep-sea sponge grounds could have a strong long-term community effect on these habitats.

PHYSIOLOGICAL AND ECOTOXICOLOGICAL EFFECTS ON INDIVIDUAL SPONGES

Main impacts of routine offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges

Seismic surveying during hydrocarbon exploration and appraisal phases

During the initial phases of exploration and appraisal, seismic surveys are conducted to assess sub-seafloor structures and determine drilling location (DTI 2001). Impact of seismic surveys on marine invertebrates and larval development and survival has been investigated in several studies (Aguilar de Soto *et al.* 2013; Nedelec *et al.* 2014). Developmental delays and malformations in scallops have been identified as potential effects of seismic surveys on benthic organisms (Aguilar de Soto *et al.* 2013). In gastropods, seismic pulses decrease larval development and increased mortality by over 20% (Nedelec *et al.* 2014). However, no studies have yet investigated the effect of seismic surveys on sponges or their larval stages.

Sedimentation from seabed disturbance

The phases of offshore exploration and development are characterised by drilling and the installation of heavy infrastructure, which are associated with re-suspension of sediments

that can affect local benthic organisms including deep-sea sponges (OSPAR Commission 2010) (Fig. 2). Bell *et al.* (2015) summarized the often species-specific effects of sedimentation on marine sponges, focussing mainly on shallow-water species. Increased sedimentation impacts sponge filtration and feeding (Reiswig 1971; Bannister *et al.* 2012 amongst others), respiration (Lohrer *et al.* 2006; Bannister *et al.* 2012 amongst others), reproduction (Roberts *et al.* 2006 amongst others) and growth (Wilkinson and Vacelet, 1979; Roberts *et al.* 2006 amongst others). Additionally, evidence of tissues sloughing in shallow-water sponge *Halichondria panicea* was found after exposure to increased sedimentation (Barthel and Wolfrath 1989). Studies on deep-water sponges have confirmed some of the findings made on shallow-water sponges. Heavy sedimentation on deep-water sponge *Geodia barretti* led to a 50% to 86% reduced respiration rate depending on sediment concentration tested but was associated with a fast recovery after exposure to sediments (Tjensvoll *et al.* 2013; Kutti *et al.* 2015). Furthermore, sedimentation caused a rapid arrest in feeding behaviour and chamber clogging in the two deep-sea glass sponges *Rhabdocalyptus dawsoni* and *Aphrocallites vastus*. However, some aspects in the response of the two glass sponge species differed: feeding was resumed earlier in *A. vastus* and sediment level required to halt feeding was lower for *R. dawsoni* (Tompkins-Macdonald and Leys, 2008). This shows that increase in sedimentation have an overall negative impact on deep-sea sponges, with some species more resilient than others.

Release of contaminants in the environment during routine operations

Routine operations during the production phase of an oil field development include the discharge to the sea of produced water that contains small amounts of hydrocarbons such as polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), dissolved metals and naturally occurring radioactive elements such as radium-226 and radium-228 (Fig. 2) (Neff *et al.* 2011).

Although the volume of oil released into the sea in the NE Atlantic through produced water discharges has overall been reduced following industry effort through decision such as OSPAR recommendation 2001/1, produced water still remains the main source of hydrocarbons in the environment from oil and gas industry linked activities (OSPAR Commission 2010; Neff *et al.* 2011). Upon release, produced water is believed to be diluted very rapidly into the ambient seawater (Neff *et al.* 2011). Therefore, although some PAHs are persistent compounds in the environment and can be toxic at higher concentration as discussed in the next section (for accidental releases of hydrocarbons), produced water is expected to have a very low impact on marine organisms (Neff *et al.* 2011). However, PAHs from produced water could have sub-lethal effects on deep-sea sponges. Benthic suspension feeders such as mussels have been shown to accumulate PAHs when exposed to produced water (Sundt *et al.* 2011). Moreover, low concentration of PAHs can be bioaccumulated in sponges at higher levels than mussels (Negri *et al.* 2006; Batista *et al.* 2013; Mahaut *et al.* 2013; Gentric *et al.* 2016). Changes in fatty acid content in sponges exposed to PAHs has also been observed. It has therefore been suggested to use sponges as environmental bioindicators for PAHs concentration monitoring (Batista *et al.* 2013).

Dissolved metals can also be present in produced water including barium, iron, manganese, mercury and zinc. Shallow-water sponges are known to bioaccumulate zinc (Gentric *et al.* 2016). It is consequently possible that deep-sea sponges could also bioaccumulate metals in their tissue from produced water exposition but no study has been conducted so far on this subject. Notably, zinc naturally present in the environment has been shown to be incorporated into sponge spicules (Hendry and Andersen 2013). However, no studies looking at the impact of metal concentration from anthropogenic sources in sponge spicules have been conducted so far.

Decommissioning

Removal of aging offshore infrastructures during decommissioning could lead to an increase in sedimentation and a release of hydrocarbons and other chemicals into the marine environment (Fig. 2) (Fowler *et al.* 2014). Yet targeted disturbance experiments of the drill cuttings accumulated on the seafloor demonstrate no major effect on the spatial distribution of cuttings contamination or the biological communities present in the seabed located greater than 100 m from the original location of the installation (OSPAR Commission 2009b). It has to be born in mind, however, that the removal of large anchors or installations on the seafloor will likely cause resuspension of a much larger extent. Intensive water column and sediment monitoring will be required to assess the effects of the removal of individual or multiple installations.

As previously stated, no infrastructure decommissioning project has yet taken place within deep-sea sponge grounds and so potential impacts of decommissioning at individual level is for the moment unknown. It can only be hypothesized that impacts on deep-sea sponges associated with high sedimentation rate and hydrocarbon pollution described during the exploration, development and production phases could also occur during the decommissioning phase.

Impacts of accidental hydrocarbon release and dispersants use on deep-sea sponges

During accidental spills, large amounts of hydrocarbons are released directly into the marine environment. During oil spills, PAHs are of particular concern when considering ecotoxicological impacts on organisms present in the vicinity of the spill location (Blackburn *et al.* 2014 and references therein). In shallow-water sponges, high concentrations of PAHs have been shown to disturb sponge larval settlement and development (Cebrian and Uriz 2007; Negri *et al.* 2016). Effects of dispersants and dispersed oil on larval stages of various

other marine organisms have been investigated but results of higher toxicity associated with the use of dispersant seem to depend on the organisms considered and the duration of exposition (Singer *et al.* 1998; Epstein *et al.* 2000, Stefansson *et al.* 2016). In tropical corals, exposure to dispersed crude oil resulted in increased mortality in larvae of the coral *Stylophora pistillata* and a stronger decrease in larvae settlement rate compared to exposure to crude oil alone (Epstein *et al.* 2000). Furthermore, exposure to dispersed oil and dispersants alone has led to a strong health decline (defined by percentage of live polyps and tissue coverage) in three deep-water coral species from the Gulf of Mexico (DeLeo *et al.* 2016). To the authors' knowledge no studies have yet tested the effects of dispersed oil or dispersants on marine sponges and sponge larvae.

Long-term impacts of a deep-sea oil spill could be derived from sediment associated hydrocarbons. It is estimated that 35% of the oil released into the marine environment during the *Braer* oil spilled off the Shetland Islands in the northeast Atlantic subsequently ended up in subtidal sediments (Davies *et al.* 1997). PAHs and hydrocarbon breakdown is slowed down in sediments owing to overall anoxic conditions within the sediments (Atlas and Hazen 2011 and references therein). However, benthic organisms can be exposed to sediment associated PAHs or hydrocarbon via sediment resuspension. Bivalves are able to accumulate PAHs from the sediment during resuspension episodes (Nandini Menon and Menon 1999). It has been suggested that deep-sea sponges can derive part of their nutrition from re-suspended matter (Hogg *et al.* 2010) and therefore could be impacted by PAH contaminated sediments. Furthermore, Culbertson and collaborators (2008) showed that short-term and long-term exposure to 38-year-old residual petroleum associated with sediments led to a decrease in growth rate, lower health condition and decreased filtration rate in mussels. Dispersants have also been shown to persist in deep-sea sediments as dispersants were quantified in sediments collected within deep-sea coral communities 6 months after the *Deepwater Horizon* spill

(White *et al.* 2014). This suggests that oil spill can have long term impacts on deep-sea benthic organisms when hydrocarbon and dispersants enter the sediments, which is of concern for deep-sea sponges.

EFFECT ON DEEP-SEA SPONGES AT CELLULAR AND MOLECULAR SCALES

Impacts of offshore oil and gas production activities on deep-sea sponges at a cellular level

During the production phase of offshore oil field development, the release of drill muds has been shown to impact deep-sea sponges at a cellular level (Edge *et al.* 2016).

Barite, one of the major solid components of these drill muds has been shown to decrease lysosomal membrane stability in the deep-sea sponge *G. barretti* (Edge *et al.* 2016).

Hydrocarbon contamination including PAH pollution is also a main concern when considering cellular impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on sponges. Water accommodated oil fraction (solution of soluble hydrocarbons in seawater) activates the Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase (MAPK) and apoptosis pathways in the sponge *Suberites domuncula* (Châtel *et al.* 2011). The MAPK pathway plays an important role in cellular response to environmental and oxidative stress (Regoli and Giuliani 2014). Increased DNA damage was also detected in *S. domuncula* (Châtel *et al.* 2011), confirming previous work conducted by Zahn *et al.* (1981, 1983) showing exposure to PAH induced DNA damage in the shallow-water sponge *Tethya lyncurium*.

Furthermore, the cytochrome P450-dependent monooxygenase system has also been shown to be involved in the detoxification of PAH benzo-a-pyrene, in two marine sponge species (Solé and Livingstone 2005). Lower yields of cytochrome P450 protein were detected in sponges compared with other phyla (Cnidaria, Mollusca, Annelida, Arthropoda, Echinodermata and Chordata) but this could result from overall lower metabolic rates (Solé

and Livingstone 2005). Under PAHs contaminated conditions produced in the laboratory, PAH molecules interact with the aryl hydrocarbon receptor and induce the cytochrome P450 pathway (Regoli and Giuliani 2014). The cytochrome P450 pathway is known to play an important role in oxidative stress responses (Solé and Livingston 2005), which are induced in many organisms after exposure to PAHs (Nebert *et al.* 2000; Puga *et al.* 2002; Regoli and Giuliani 2014 amongst others). Oxidative stress is a consequence of an imbalance in the antioxidant system in an organism. Normal aerobic metabolism produces reactive oxygen species (ROS), which are neutralised by the antioxidant system. Exposure to xenobiotic compounds can increase the formation of ROS and decrease the antioxidant system's functioning. Formation of ROS in turn, downregulates the cytochrome P450, which limits the organism's capacity to deal with contaminants such as PAHs (Regoli and Giuliani 2014). The role of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor in organisms impacted by oil spills was recently confirmed in a transcriptomic study showing an induction of a large amount of stress response genes such as the aryl hydrocarbon receptor and the glutathione-S-transferase in oysters deployed during the *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill (Jenny *et al.* 2016). However, to the authors knowledge, no studies have reported the activation of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor and cytochrome P450 pathway in deep-sea sponges.

Dispersants themselves have been shown to trigger cellular stress responses in different organisms. In the commonly used model organism *Caenorhabditis elegans* (Nematoda), exposure to dispersant Corexit™ 9500A caused the abnormal expression of twelve genes, involved in a wide range of biological processes ranging from egg-laying to neurological functions and oxidative stress (Zhang *et al.* 2013). However, in the tropical coral *Montastraea franksi*, Corexit™ 9527 exposure led to increased expression of genes coding for P-glycoprotein, heat shock protein 70 and heat shock protein 90 and, to a lesser extent, proteins involved in other cellular stress responses (Venn *et al.* 2009). Furthermore, exposure

to dispersants alone as well as dispersants and crude oil lead to an increase in cell membrane damages in diatoms, which was not observable in diatoms exposed to oil alone (Hook and Osborn 2012). No studies so far have investigated the impact of dispersants on marine sponges.

Impacts of offshore oil and gas production activities on deep-sea sponge associated micro-organisms

Sponges host highly diverse microbial communities often compared for its complexity to the bacterial community of the human gut (Hentschel *et al.* 2012). Although bacteria generally dominate deep-sea sponge microbial communities, eukaryotic and archaeal symbionts have also been described. Mainly found in the mesohyl of the sponges these microbes are metabolically very active and are believed to play important roles in the nitrogen and carbon metabolism (Li *et al.* 2014). Deep-sea sponges are a rich source of secondary metabolites of great interest as new therapeutic compounds and it is often the associated microbial communities that synthesises these compounds. Sponges' secondary metabolites show properties that include antifouling, antifungal, antibacterial or antiviral properties and are believed to play a major role in sponge defence against diseases or against other benthic organisms competing for the same substrata (Sipkema *et al.* 2005).

The impact of environmental pollution and specifically exposure to hydrocarbons or other offshore oil and gas extraction activities on the sponge-associated microbial communities are currently unknown. Studies have investigated the stability of the shallow-water sponge associated microbial community when exposed to thermal stress, changes in seawater pH or to high metal concentrations (Webster and Hill. 2001; Webster *et al.* 2008; Selvin *et al.* 2009; Fan *et al.* 2013; Fang *et al.* 2013; Tian *et al.* 2014). However, only a few of these studies

found, under stressed conditions, a shift in the associated microbial community composition (Webster and Hill. 2001; Webster *et al.* 2008; Fan *et al.* 2013; Tian *et al.* 2014). A change in associated microbes was also correlated with a decline in overall sponge host health status characterised by an increase in sponge tissue necrosis and increased expression of genes linked to cellular oxidative stress (Webster and Hill. 2001; Webster *et al.* 2008; Fan *et al.* 2013; Tian *et al.* 2014). An oil degrading surfactant biosynthesis gene has been isolated from bacteria associated with the shallow-water sponge *Acanthella sp* (Anburajan *et al.* 2015). However, the capacity of the bacteria to synthesize the surfactant when associated with the marine sponge and when exposed to crude oil was not investigated (Anburajan *et al.* 2015). In the Gulf of Mexico, the deep-sea sponge *Myxilla methanophila* growing on tubeworms near cold-seeps was described to be associated with putative oil degrading bacteria after deep-sequencing of its associated microbial community (Arellano *et al.* 2013). In this case, it was hypothesized that the sponge had acquired the symbiont from its environment naturally rich in hydrocarbons (Arellano *et al.* 2013). Whether the bacteria played a role in hydrocarbon detoxification or in sponge nutrition was not be investigated (Arellano *et al.* 2013). The capacity of deep-sea marine sponges to acquire oil-degrading bacteria after an oil spill event has not yet been investigated.

CONCLUSIONS

Oil and gas activities are today taking place in deeper settings and will impact deep-sea ecosystems. Oil and gas production activities impact deep-sea sponges and the habitats they form at all stages of field development and at community, individual and cellular levels as summarised in table 2. At community level, physical disturbance and discharge of drill muds have been shown to decrease diversity and density of organisms associated with deep-sea sponge grounds. At individual level, physical disturbance and increased sedimentation

497 inhibit the filtration systems of deep-sea sponges, while the discharge of produced water and
498 drill cuttings could lead to bioaccumulation of hydrocarbons and metals (as shown in
499 shallow-water sponges). At cellular and molecular levels, discharge of drill muds and
500 produced water could trigger cellular stress responses as has been shown for shallow-water
501 sponges exposed to PAH and metal contaminated seawater. Accidental releases of
502 hydrocarbons and the use of dispersants during oil spill could result in benthic diversity
503 decrease, individual sponge mortality and larval settlement disruption as well as trigger
504 oxidative stress. However, most of the possible impacts described in this review have not yet
505 been studied in deep-sea sponges.

506 Offshore oil and gas activities are managed by national legislations within the
507 exclusive economic zones and under United Nations legislations in the high seas. In most
508 countries, oil companies are required to complete EIAs before starting any new operation
509 (Budd 1999). EIAs have become a major component of oil and gas industry regulation as
510 their aim is to identify and manage adverse environmental impacts before they occur by: (1)
511 screening for possible impacts (2) completing baseline surveys (3) producing Environmental
512 Statements and (4) leading the decision-making process. The major benefits of EIAs are that
513 the environment is considered in an early stage of the project and that scientific data are
514 acquired during the EIA process (Budd 1999). However, despite its widespread use in
515 offshore activity regulation, EIAs' project specific approach means that cumulative
516 environmental impacts owing to the development of several oil fields in the same area cannot
517 be taken into account (Baker and Jones 2013) and by their nature EIAs have to rely on
518 existing scientific understanding of ecosystems function. Despite promising advances in
519 recent years the latter remains poorly developed in deep-water settings including those that
520 support deep-sea sponge grounds. Strategic Environmental Assessments are therefore now
521 starting to be adopted by the oil & gas industry (Fidler and Noble 2012). National

jurisdictions apply only to waters within the 200 nm EEZ of coastal states. However, deep-sea sponge grounds occur beyond the EEZ of coastal states. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) signed in 1972 first enabled the deep-sea floor and High Seas to be exploited for biological and geological resources and technological improvements over time have made the deep-sea accessible (Ramirez-Llodra *et al.* 2011). In 2008 Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs) were defined by the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity to help international organisations protect key marine environments. Following this, 8 EBSAs were proposed in September 2011 in the northeast Atlantic to protect cold-water corals and sponge grounds (Weaver and Johnson 2012) but have not been subsequently developed. Since 2009, deep-sea sponge grounds are considered by the UN Food & Agriculture Organisation as Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems, as defined by the General Assembly resolution 61/105, calling states to restrict destructive fishing practices. Although VME designations are used to control the adverse effect of fishing on marine species, it brings organisms with specific conservation needs to light and is therefore also useful in the context of offshore oil and gas industry activities. In addition to EBSA and VME designations, the development of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and design of connected networks have gained momentum during the early 2000 under the OSPAR convention (Howell 2010; O’Leary *et al.* 2012). Indeed, deep-sea sponges entered the OSPAR Threatened and/or Declining Species and Habitat list in 2008. Criteria for the designation of MPAs were determined by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) in 1994 and include ecological, scientific and economic importance (Howell 2010).

Lack of scientific data on the effects of deep-sea hydrocarbon exploitation activities on deep-sea benthic organisms such as sponges is limiting the efficiency of national and international management and monitoring regulations. Collaborative initiatives between academic and industry partners provide a constructive way to close the current knowledge

547 gaps. The access to and sharing of environmental data between industry and academia should
548 also be encouraged (Murray et al. IN PREP). Furthermore, the increasing use of new
549 technologies and methodologies such as Autonomous Underwater Vehicles and predictive
550 habitat modelling to survey and map large areas of the seabed will offer new opportunities to
551 increase our understanding deep-sea benthic environments. As oil and gas production
552 activities already occur within deep-sea sponge grounds, further collaboration between
553 industry and research partners to better monitor the effect of oil and gas activities on deep-sea
554 sponge and deep-sea sponge grounds are urgently needed.

REFERENCES

1. Aguilar de Soto N, Delorme N, Atkins J, Howard S, Williams J and Johnson M (2013). Anthropogenic noise causes body malformations and delays development in marine larvae. *Scientific Reports* 3, 2831.
2. Anburajan L, Meena B, Raghavan RV, Shridhar D, Joseph TC, Vinithkumar NV *et al.* (2015). Heterologous expression, purification, and phylogenetic analysis of oil-degrading biosurfactant biosynthesis genes from the marine sponge-associated *Bacillus licheniformis* NIOT-06. *Bioprocess Biosyst. Eng.* 38, 1009–1018.
3. Arellano SM, Lee OO, Lafi FF, Yang J, Wang Y, Young CM *et al.* (2013). Deep Sequencing of *Myxilla (Ectyomyxilla) methanophila*, an Epibiotic Sponge on Cold-Seep Tubeworms, Reveals Methylophilic, Thiotrophic, and Putative Hydrocarbon-Degrading Microbial Associations. *Microb. Ecol.* 65, 450–461.
4. Atlas RM and Hazen TC (2011). Oil biodegradation and bioremediation: A tale of the two worst spills in U.S. history. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45, 6709–6715.
5. Bannister RJ, Battershill CN and De Nys R. (2012). Suspended sediment grain size and mineralogy across the continental shelf of the Great Barrier Reef: Impacts on the physiology of a coral reef sponge. *Continental Shelf Research*, 32, 86-95.
6. Barker A and Jones C (2013). A critique of the performance of EIA within the offshore oil and gas sector. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* 43, 31–39.
7. Barthel D and Wolfrath B (1989). Tissue sloughing in the sponge *Halichondria panicea*: a fouling organism prevents being fouled. *Oecologia*, 78(3), 357-360.
8. Batista D, Tellini K, Nudi AH, Massone TP, de L Scofield A and de LR Wagener A (2013). Marine sponges as bioindicators of oil and combustion derived PAH in coastal waters. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 92, 234–243.

- 579 9. Bell JJ, McGrath E, Biggerstaff A, Bates T, Bennett H, Marlow J *et al.* (2015). Sediment
580 impacts on marine sponges. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 94, 5–13.
- 581 10. Benneer LS (2015). Offshore Oil and Gas Drilling: A Review of Regulatory Regimes in
582 the United States , United Kingdom , and Norway. *Rev. Environ. Econ. Policy* 0, 1–21.
- 583 11. Beyer J, Trannum HC, Bakke T, Hodson PV and Collier TK (2016). Environmental
584 effects of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill: A review. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 110, 28–51.
- 585 12. Blackburn M, Mazzacano CAS, Fallon C and Black SH (2014). OIL IN OUR OCEANS
586 A Review of the Impacts of Oil Spills on Marine Invertebrates. *The Xeres Society for*
587 *Invertebrate Conservation* 1–160.
- 588 13. Budd M (1999). The application of environmental assessment to marine developments
589 and activities in Great Britain. *Mar. Policy* 23, 439–451.
- 590 14. Camilli R, Reddy CM, Yoerger DR, Van Mooy BAS, Jakuba MV, Kinsey JC *et al.*
591 (2010). Tracking hydrocarbon plume transport and biodegradation at Deepwater Horizon.
592 *Science* 330, 201–204.
- 593 15. Cathalot C, Van Oevelen D, Cox TJS, Kutti T, Lavaleye M, Duineveld G and Meysman
594 FJR (2015). Cold-water coral reefs and adjacent sponge grounds: hotspots of benthic
595 respiration and organic carbon cycling in the deep sea. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 2 (37).
- 596 16. Cebrian E and Uriz MJ (2007). Contrasting effects of heavy metals and hydrocarbons on
597 larval settlement and juvenile survival in sponges. *Aquat. Toxicol.* 81, 137–143.
- 598 17. Châtel A, Talarmin H, Hamer B, Schröder HC, Müller WEG and Dorange G (2011).
599 MAP kinase cell signaling pathway as biomarker of environmental pollution in the
600 sponge *Suberites domuncula*. *Ecotoxicology* 20, 1727–1740.
- 601 18. Chu JWF, Maldonado M, Yahel G and Leys SP (2011). Glass sponge reefs as a silicon
602 sink. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 441, 1–14.

603 19. Cordes EE, Jones DO, Schlacher TA, Amon DJ, Bernadino AF, Brooke S *et al.* (2016)
604 Environmental impacts of the deep-water oil and gas industry: a review to guide
605 management strategies. *Front. Environ. Sci.* 4, 58.

606 20. Culbertson JB, Valiela I, Olsen YS and Reddy CM (2008). Effect of field exposure to 38-
607 year-old residual petroleum hydrocarbons on growth, condition index, and filtration rate
608 of the ribbed mussel, *Geukensia demissa*. *Environ. Pollut.* 154, 312–319.

609 21. Davies JM, McIntosh AD, Stagg R, Topping G and Rees J (1997). The fate of the Braer
610 oil in the marine and terrestrial environments. In: *The Impact of an Oil Spill in Turbulent*
611 *Waters: The Braer*. 26– 41.

612 22. Dayton PK, Kim S, Jarrell SC, Oliver JS, Hammerstrom K, Fisher JL *et al.* (2013).
613 Recruitment, growth and mortality of an Antarctic hexactinellid sponge, *Anoxycalyx*
614 *joubini*. *PLoS One* 8, e56939.

615 23. De Goeij JM, van Oevelen D, Vermeij MJA, Osinga R, Middelburg JJ, de Goeij AF PM
616 *et al.* (2013). Surviving in a Marine Desert: The Sponge Loop Retains Resources Within
617 Coral Reefs. *Science*. 342, 108–110.

618 24. DeLeo DM, Ruiz-Ramos DV, Baums IB and Cordes EE (2016). Response of deep-water
619 corals to oil and chemical dispersant exposure. *Deep. Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.*
620 129, 137–147.

621 25. Department of Energy and Climate Change, Offshore Decommissioning Unit (2011).
622 Decommissioning of Offshore Oil and Gas Installations and Pipelines under the
623 Petroleum Act 1998. *DECC Guidance Notes. Version 6*, 140pp.

624 26. Department of Trade and Industry (2001). Overview of Offshore Oil and Gas Exploration
625 and Production Activities. 29pp. Available at:
626 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/197799/S
627 [D_SEA2EandP.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/197799/S_D_SEA2EandP.pdf).

- 628 27. Diercks AR, Highsmith RC, Asper VL, Joung D, Zhou Z, Guo L *et al.* (2010).
629 Characterization of subsurface polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons at the Deepwater
630 Horizon site. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37 (20).
- 631 28. Du Preez C and Tunnicliffe V (2011). Shortspine thornyhead and rockfish (Scorpaenidae)
632 distribution in response to substratum, biogenic structures and trawling. *Mar. Ecol. Prog.*
633 *Ser.* 425, 217–231.
- 634 29. Dunham A, Pegg JR, Carolsfeld W, Davies S, Murfitt I and Boutillier J (2015). Effects of
635 submarine power transmission cables on a glass sponge reef and associated megafaunal
636 community. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 107, 50–60.
- 637 30. Edge KJ, Johnston EL, Dafforn KA, Simpson SL, Kutti T and Bannister RJ (2016). Sub-
638 lethal effects of water-based drilling muds on the deep-water sponge *Geodia barretti*.
639 *Environ. Pollut.* 212, 525–534.
- 640 31. Ellis JI, Fraser G and Russell J (2012). Discharged drilling waste from oil and gas
641 platforms and its effects on benthic communities. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 456, 285–302.
- 642 32. Epstein N, Bak RPM and Rinkevich B (2000). Toxicity of third generation dispersants
643 and dispersed Egyptian crude oil on Red Sea coral larvae. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 40, 497–503.
- 644 33. Fallon SJ, James K, Norman R, Kelly M and Ellwood MJ (2010). A simple radiocarbon
645 dating method for determining the age and growth rate of deep-sea sponges. *Nucl.*
646 *Instruments Methods Phys. Res. Sect. B Beam Interact. with Mater. Atoms* 268, 1241–
647 1243.
- 648 34. Fan L, Liu M, Simister R, Webster NS and Thomas T (2013). Marine microbial
649 symbiosis heats up: the phylogenetic and functional response of a sponge holobiont to
650 thermal stress. *ISME J.* 7, 991–1002.

- 651 35. Fang JKH, Mello-Athayde MA, Schönberg CHL, Kline DI, Hoegh-Guldberg O and Dove
652 S (2013). Sponge biomass and bioerosion rates increase under ocean warming and
653 acidification. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 19, 3581–3591.
- 654 36. Fidler C and Noble B (2012). Advancing strategic environmental assessment in the
655 offshore oil and gas sector: Lessons from Norway, Canada, and the United Kingdom.
656 *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* 34, 12–21.
- 657 37. Fowler AM, Macreadie PI, Jones DOB and Booth DJ (2014). A multi-criteria decision
658 approach to decommissioning of offshore oil and gas infrastructure. *Ocean Coast.*
659 *Manag.* 87, 20–29.
- 660 38. Freese JL and Wing BL (2003). Juvenile red rockfish, *Sebastes sp.*, associations with
661 sponges in the Gulf of Alaska. *Marine Fisheries Review*, 65(3), 38–42.
- 662 39. Gates AR, Benfield MC, Booth DJ, Fowler AM, Skropeta D and Jones DOB (2016).
663 Deep-sea observations at hydrocarbon drilling locations: Contributions from the
664 SERPENT Project after 120 field visits. *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.*
- 665 40. Gates AR and Jones DO (2012). Recovery of benthic megafauna from anthropogenic
666 disturbance at a hydrocarbon drilling well (380 m depth in the Norwegian Sea). *PloS one*,
667 7(10), e44114.
- 668 41. Gentric C, Rehel K, Dufour A and Sauleau P (2016). Bioaccumulation of metallic trace
669 elements and organic pollutants in marine sponges from the South Brittany Coast, France.
670 *J. Environ. Sci. Heal. Part A* 51, 213–219.
- 671 42. Hendry KR and Andersen MB (2013). The zinc isotopic composition of siliceous marine
672 sponges: Investigating nature’s sediment traps. *Chem. Geol.* 354, 33–41.
- 673 43. Henry L-A and Roberts JM (2014). Applying the OSPAR habitat definition of deep-sea
674 sponge aggregations to verify suspected records of the habitat in UK waters. *JNCC*
675 *Report No 508*, 41pp.

- 676 44. Henry L-A, Harries DB, Kingston PF, Roberts JM (2017) Historic scale and persistence
677 of drill cuttings impacts on North Sea benthos. *Mar. Environ. Res.*
- 678 45. Hentschel U, Piel J, Degnan SM and Taylor MW (2012). Genomic insights into the
679 marine sponge microbiome. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 10, 641–654.
- 680 46. Hoffmann F, Radax R, Woebken D, Holtappels M, Lavik G, Rapp HT *et al.* (2009).
681 Complex nitrogen cycling in the sponge *Geodia barretti*. *Environ. Microbiol.* 11, 2228–
682 2243.
- 683 47. Hogg MM, Tendal OS, Conway KW, Pomponi SA, Van Soest RWM, Gut J *et al.* (2010).
684 Deep-sea sponge grounds: Reservoirs of Biodiversity. *UNEP-WCMC Biodiversity Series*
685 *No 32*, 84pp.
- 686 48. Hook SE and Osborn HL (2012). Comparison of toxicity and transcriptomic profiles in a
687 diatom exposed to oil, dispersants, dispersed oil. *Aquat. Toxicol.* 124–125, 139–151.
- 688 49. Howell KL (2010). A benthic classification system to aid in the implementation of marine
689 protected area networks in the deep/high seas of the NE Atlantic. *Biol. Conserv.* 143,
690 1041–1056.
- 691 50. Huvenne VAI, Bett BJ, Masson DG, Le Bas TP and Wheeler AJ (2016). Effectiveness of
692 a deep-sea cold-water coral Marine Protected Area, following eight years of fisheries
693 closure. *Biol. Conserv.* 200, 60-69.
- 694 51. Jenny MJ, Walton WC, Payton SL, Powers JM, Findlay RH, Shields BO *et al.* (2016).
695 Transcriptomic evaluation of the American oyster, *Crassostrea virginica*, deployed
696 during the Deepwater Horizon oil spill: Evidence of an active hydrocarbon response
697 pathway. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 120, 166–181.
- 698 52. Jernelöv A (2010). The Threats from Oil Spills: Now, Then, and in the Future. *Ambio* 39,
699 353–366.

- 700 53. Jones DOB, Hudson IR and Bett BJ (2006). Effects of physical disturbance on the cold-
701 water megafaunal communities of the Faroe-Shetland Channel. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*
702 319, 43–54.
- 703 54. Jones DOB, Gates AR and Lausen B (2012). Recovery of deep-water megafaunal
704 assemblages from hydrocarbon drilling disturbance in the Faroe-Shetland Channel. *Mar.*
705 *Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 461, 71–82.
- 706 55. Kark S, Brokovich E, Mazor T and Levin N (2015). Emerging conservation challenges
707 and prospects in an era of offshore hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation. *Conserv.*
708 *Biol.* 29, 1573–1585.
- 709 56. Kazanidis G, Henry LA, Roberts JM and Witte UFM (2015). Biodiversity of
710 *Spongosorites coralliophaga* (Stephens, 1915) on coral rubble at two contrasting cold-
711 water coral reef settings. *Coral Reefs*.
- 712 57. Kingston PF (2002). Long-term environmental impact of oil spills. *Spill Sci. Technol.*
713 *Bull.* 7, 53–61.
- 714 58. Kutti T, Bannister RJ, Helge J, Krogness CM, Tjensvoll I and Søvnik G (2015). Metabolic
715 responses of the deep-water sponge *Geodia barretti* to suspended bottom sediment,
716 simulated mine tailings and drill cuttings. *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.* 473, 64–72.
- 717 59. Li ZY, Wang YZ, He LM and Zheng HJ (2014). Metabolic profiles of prokaryotic and
718 eukaryotic communities in deep-sea sponge *Lamellomorpha sp.* indicated by
719 metagenomics. *Sci. Rep.* 4, 1–11.
- 720 60. Lohrer AM, Hewitt JE and Thrush SF (2006). Assessing far-field effects of terrigenous
721 sediment loading in the coastal marine environment. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*,
722 315, 13-18.

- 723 61. Mahaut ML, Basuyaux O, Baudinière E, Chataignier C, Pain J and Caplat C (2013). The
724 porifera *Hymeniacidon perlevis* (Montagu, 1818) as a bioindicator for water quality
725 monitoring. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. Int.* 20, 2984–92.
- 726 62. Maldonado M, Aguilar R, Bannister RJ, James J, Conway KW, Dayton PK *et al.* (2016).
727 “Sponge Grounds as key marine habitats: a synthetic review of types, structure,
728 functional roles and conservation concerns,” in *Marine Animal Forests*, 1–39.
- 729 63. Maldonado M (2016). Sponge waste that fuels marine oligotrophic food webs: a re-
730 assessment of its origin and nature. *Mar. Ecol.*, 1–15.
- 731 64. Managi S, Opaluch JJ, Jin D and Grigalunas TA (2005). Technological change and
732 petroleum exploration in the Gulf of Mexico. *Energy Policy* 33, 619–632.
- 733 65. McMurray SE, Blum JE and Pawlik JR (2008) Redwood of the reef: growth and age of
734 the giant barrel sponge *Xestospongi muta* in the Florida Keys. *Mar Biol* 155:159-171.
- 735 66. Muehlenbachs L, Cohen MA and Gerarden T (2013). The impact of water depth on safety
736 and environmental performance in offshore oil and gas production. *Energy Policy* 55,
737 699–705.
- 738 67. Montagna PA, Baguley JG, Cooksey C, Hartwell I, Hyde LJ, Hyland JL *et al.* (2013).
739 Deep-Sea Benthic Footprint of the Deepwater Horizon Blowout. *PLoS One* 8, e70540.
- 740 68. Nandini Menon N and Menon NR (1999). Uptake of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
741 from suspended oil borne sediments by the marine bivalve *Sunetta scripta*. *Aquat.*
742 *Toxicol.* 45, 63–69.
- 743 69. Nebert DW, Roe AL, Dieter MZ, Solis WA, Yang Y and Dalton TP (2000). Role of the
744 aromatic hydrocarbon receptor and [Ah] gene battery in the oxidative stress response, cell
745 cycle control, and apoptosis. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 59, 65–85.

746 70. Nedelec SL, Radford AN, Simpson SD, Nedelec B, Lecchini D and Mills SC (2014).
747 Anthropogenic noise playback impairs embryonic development and increases mortality in
748 a marine invertebrate. *Scientific Reports* 4, 5891.

749 71. Neff J, Lee K and DeBlois EM (2011). Produced water: overview of composition, fates,
750 and effects. *Produced Water*, Springer New York, 3-54.

751 72. Negri A, Burns K, Boyle S, Brinkman D and Webster N (2006). Contamination in
752 sediments, bivalves and sponges of McMurdo Sound, Antarctica. *Environ. Pollut.* 143,
753 456–467.

754 73. Negri AP, Brinkman DL, Flores F, Botté ES, Jones RJ and Webster NS (2016). Acute
755 ecotoxicology of natural oil and gas condensate to coral reef larvae. *Sci. Rep.* 6.

756 74. O’Leary BC, Brown RL, Johnson DE, von Nordheim H, Ardron J, Packeiser T *et al.*
757 (2012). The first network of marine protected areas (MPAs) in the high seas: The process,
758 the challenges and where next. *Mar. Policy* 36, 598–605.

759 75. OSPAR Commission (2009a). Assessment of impacts of offshore oil and gas activities in
760 the North-East Atlantic. OSPAR Commission, London. Publication number 453/2009,
761 London, pp. 1-40.

762 76. OSPAR Commission (2009b). Assessment of the possible effects of releases of oil and
763 chemicals from any disturbance of cuttings piles (2009 update). OSPAR Report 337
764 (update 2009), OSPAR Industry Series, pp. 1-11.

765 77. OSPAR Commission (2010). Offshore Oil and Gas industry. Quality Status Report 63-70.

766 78. OSPAR Commission (2016). Impacts of certain pressures of the offshore oil and gas
767 industry on the marine environment – stocktaking report. OSPAR Commission, London.
768 Offshore Industry Report 684/2016, London, pp. 1-24.

769 79. Peterson CH, Anderson SS, Cherr GN, Ambrose RF, Anghera S, Bay S *et al.* (2012). A
770 Tale of Two Spills: Novel Science and Policy Implications of an Emerging New Oil Spill
771 Model. *Bioscience* 62, 461–469.

772 80. Puga A, Marlowe J, Barnes S, Chang CY, Maier A, Tan Z *et al.* (2002). Role of the aryl
773 hydrocarbon receptor in cell cycle regulation. *Toxicology* 181–182, 171–177.

774 81. Ramirez-Llodra E, Tyler PA, Baker MC, Bergstad OA, Clark MR, Escobar E *et al.*
775 (2011). Man and the last great wilderness: human impact on the deep sea. *PLoS One* 6,
776 e22588.

777 82. Regoli F and Giuliani ME (2014). Oxidative pathways of chemical toxicity and oxidative
778 stress biomarkers in marine organisms. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 93, 106–117.

779 83. Reiswig HM (1971). *In situ* pumping activities of tropical Demospongiae. *Marine*
780 *Biology*, 9(1), 38-50.

781 84. Rix L, de Goeij JM, Mueller CE, Struck U, Middelburg JJ, van Duyl FC *et al.* (2016).
782 Coral mucus fuels the sponge loop in warm- and cold-water coral reef ecosystems. *Sci.*
783 *Rep.* 6, 18715.

784 85. Roberts D, Davis AR and Cummins SP (2006). Experimental manipulation of shade, silt,
785 nutrients and salinity on the temperate reef sponge *Cymbastela concentrica*. *Marine*
786 *Ecology Progress Series*, 307 143-154.

787 86. Selvin J, Shanmugha Priya S, Seghal Kiran G, Thangavelu T and Sapna Bai N. (2009).
788 Sponge-associated marine bacteria as indicators of heavy metal pollution. *Microbiol. Res.*
789 164, 352–363.

790 87. Singer MM, George S, Lee I, Jacobson S, Weetman LL, Blondina G *et al.* (1998). Effects
791 of dispersant treatment on the acute aquatic toxicity of petroleum hydrocarbons. *Arch.*
792 *Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 34, 177–187.

793 88. Sipkema D, Franssen MCR, Osinga R, Tramper J and Wijffels RH (2005). Marine
794 Sponges as Pharmacy. *Mar. Biotechnol.* 7, 142–162.

795 89. Solé M and Livingstone DR (2005). Components of the cytochrome P450-dependent
796 monooxygenase system and “NADPH-independent benzo[a]pyrene hydroxylase” activity
797 in a wide range of marine invertebrate species. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part C Toxicol.*
798 *Pharmacol.* 141, 20–31.

799 90. Stefansson ES, Langdon CJ, Pargee SM, Blunt SM, Gage SJ and Stubblefield WA
800 (2016). Acute effects of non-weathered and weathered crude oil and dispersant associated
801 with the Deepwater Horizon incident on the development of marine bivalve and
802 echinoderm larvae. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 35, 2016–2028.

803 91. Suchanek TH (1993). Oil Impacts on Marine Invertebrate Populations and Communities.
804 *Amer. Zool.* 33, 510–523.

805 92. Sundt RC, Pampanin DM, Grung M, Baršienė J and Ruus A (2011). PAH body burden
806 and biomarker responses in mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) exposed to produced water from a
807 North Sea oil field: Laboratory and field assessments. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 62, 1498–1505.

808 93. Tjensvoll I, Kutti T, Fosså JH and Bannister RJ (2013). Rapid respiratory responses of the
809 deep-water sponge *Geodia barrette* exposed to suspended sediments. *Aquat Biol* 19, 65-
810 73.

811 94. Thurber AR, Sweetman AK, Narayanaswamy BE, Jones DOB, Ingels J and Hansman RL
812 (2014). Ecosystem function and services provided by the deep sea. *Biogeosciences* 11,
813 3941-3963.

814 95. Tian RM, Wang Y, Bougouffa S, Gao ZM, Cai L, Zhang WP *et al.* (2014). Effect of
815 copper treatment on the composition and function of the bacterial community in the
816 Sponge *Haliclona cymaeformis*. *MBio* 5, 1–9.

- 817 96. Tompkins-Macdonald GJ and Leys SP (2008). Glass sponges arrest pumping in response
818 to sediment: Implications for the physiology of the hexactinellid conduction system. *Mar.*
819 *Biol.* 154, 973–984.
- 820 97. Trannum HC, Nilsson HC, Schaanning MT and Øxnevad S (2010). Effects of
821 sedimentation from water-based drill cuttings and natural sediment on benthic
822 macrofaunal community structure and ecosystem processes. *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.* 383,
823 111–121.
- 824 98. Valentine MM and Benfield MC (2013). Characterization of epibenthic and demersal
825 megafauna at Mississippi Canyon 252 shortly after the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.
826 *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 77, 196–209.
- 827 99. Venn AA, Quinn J, Jones R and Bodnar A. (2009). P-glycoprotein (multi-xenobiotic
828 resistance) and heat shock protein gene expression in the reef coral *Montastraea franksi*
829 in response to environmental toxicants. *Aquat. Toxicol.* 93, 188–195.
- 830 100. Weaver P and Johnson D (2012). Think big for marine conservation. *Nature* 483, 399.
- 831 101. Webster NS and Hill RT (2001). The culturable microbial community of the great barrier
832 reef sponge *Rhopaloeides odorabile* is dominated by an alpha-proteobacterium. *Mar.*
833 *Biol.* 138, 843–851.
- 834 102. Webster NS, Cobb RE and Negri AP (2008). Temperature thresholds for bacterial
835 symbiosis with a sponge. *ISME J.* 2, 830–842.
- 836 103. Webster NS and Taylor MW (2012). Marine sponges and their microbial symbionts: love
837 and other relationships. *Environ. Microbiol.* 14, 335–346.
- 838 104. White HK, Hsing PY, Cho W, Shank TM, Cordes EE, Quattrini AM *et al.* (2012). Impact
839 of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill on a deep-water coral community in the Gulf of
840 Mexico. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 109, 20303–20308.


- 841 105. White HK, Lyons SL, Harrison SJ, Findley DM, Liu Y and Kujawinski EB (2014). Long-
842 term persistence of dispersants following the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *Environ. Sci.*
843 *Technol.* 1, 5.
- 844 106. Wilkinson CR and Vacelet J (1979). Transplantation of marine sponges to different
845 conditions of light and current. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*,
846 37(1), 91-104.
- 847 107. Wulff JL (2006). Ecological interactions of marine sponges. *Can. J. Zool.* 84, 146–166.
- 848 108. Zahn RK, Zahn G and Alii E (1981). Assessing consequence of marine pollution by
849 hydrocarbons using sponges as model organisms. *Sci. Total Environ.* 20, 147–169.
- 850 109. Zahn RK, Zahn-Daimler G, Müller WEG, Michaelis ML, Kurelec B, Rijavec M *et al.*
851 (1983). DNA damage by PAH and repair in a marine sponge. *Sci. Total Environ.* 26,
852 137–156.
- 853 110. Zhang Y, Chen D, Ennis AC, Polli JR, Xiao P, Zhang B *et al.* (2013). Chemical
854 dispersant potentiates crude oil impacts on growth, reproduction, and gene expression in
855 *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Arch. Toxicol.* 87, 371–382.

856 **Acknowledgement**

857 JV acknowledges support from the Natural Environment Research Council Centre for
858 Doctoral Training in Oil & Gas, received through Heriot-Watt University (James Watt
859 Scholarship scheme) and the British Geological Survey (British University Funding Initiative
860 scheme). This paper is a contribution to the ATLAS project funded by the European
861 Commission's H2020 scheme through Grant Agreement 678760. All co-authors would like
862 to acknowledge Ellen Kenchington from Fisheries & Oceans, Canada (DFO) for providing
863 helpful comments during the drafting of this manuscript and one of the stills used in this
864 paper. All co-authors would also like to thank Andrew Gates and Daniel Jones from the
865 SERPENT Project at the National Oceanography Centre in Southampton UK for providing
866 images used in this paper.


867

868 **Figure 1: Example of deep-sea sponges and of the habitats they form.** (A, B) Example of
869 deep-sea sponge morphotypes from the Faroe-Shetland Channel. (C) Carnivorous sponges of
870 the family Cladhorizidae constitute a deep-sea ecological oddity. (D) Present in high
871 abundance, deep-sea sponges can form sponge grounds as seen here at 1890m depth from
872 Orphan Knoll, NW Atlantic. (E to H) Deep-sea sponges and sponge grounds provide habitats
873 for various benthic organisms (I and J) Sponges are impacted by offshore oil and gas
874 activities amongst other through increased sedimentation. Photo credits: (D) Fisheries &
875 Oceans, Canada (DFO). (G to I) SERPENT Project, National Oceanography Centre,
876 Southampton UK.





877

878 **Figure 2: Flow chart of oil fields development process divided into 4 phases and main**
 879 **activities associated with each phase.**



880 **Figure 3: Field data on the initial impact and recovery from oil drilling disturbance in**
881 **deep-sea sponges in the Faroe-Shetland Channel (FSC), at the Laggan site (Jones *et al.***
882 **2012), and Norwegian Sea (NS), at the Morvin site (Gates and Jones 2012).**
883 The density of all megafaunal sponges is shown with distance from drilling activity at
884 different time points (colours) after drilling (units years [yr] and days [d]). Pre indicates
885 densities prior to drilling activity.



886 **Table 1: VME and EBSA criteria and their applicability to sponge grounds as**
887 **respectively defined by the UN FAO and the UN CBD.**

Designation	Criteria	Characteristics of deep-sea sponges and/or sponge grounds fulfilling criteria
VME	Uniqueness or rarity	Deep-sea sponge grounds are not rare but occur in specific and limited areas where favourable abiotic conditions are present
	Functional significance of habitats	Deep-sea sponges increase physical heterogeneity of benthic ecosystems
	Fragility	Deep-sea sponges are extremely vulnerable to physical damage by trawling or other anthropogenic activities
	Life history traits making recovery difficult	Deep-sea sponges are considered as slow-growing, long lived organisms and their reproduction cycles are largely unknown
	Structural complexity	Deep-sea sponge grounds give three-dimensionality to seabed increasing the number of available microhabitats
EBSA	Uniqueness or rarity	Deep-sea sponge grounds are not rare but occur in specific and limited areas where favourable abiotic conditions are present
	Special importance for like history stages of species	Deep-sea sponge grounds constitute nursery grounds for fish and invertebrate species
	Importance for threatened, endangered or declining species and/or habitats	Deep-sea sponge grounds constitute nursery grounds for threaten species such economically important fishes
	Vulnerability, fragility, sensitivity or slow recovery	Deep-sea sponges are considered as slow-growing, long lived organisms, making them both vulnerable to anthropogenic activities and slow to recover
	Biological productivity	Deep-sea sponges play important roles in the biogeochemical cycling and the habitat they create support diverse benthic ecosystems
	Biological diversity	Deep-sea sponge grounds provide a habitat to diverse benthic vertebrate and invertebrate species
	Naturalness	Anthropogenic activities such as oil and gas exploitation and mining are impacting deep-sea sponge grounds

889 **Table 2: Overview of major impacts of offshore oil and gas activities on deep-sea sponges and deep-sea sponge grounds at community,**
890 **individual, cellular and molecular levels and throughout oil field development.** Impacts described in deep-sea sponge species are highlighted
891 in green. Impacts described in shallow-water sponge species but not yet confirmed for deeper species are highlighted in orange. Impacts
892 described in other benthic organisms but not yet investigated in any sponge species are highlighted in red to emphasize current knowledge gaps.

		Exploration and appraisal	Field Development	Production	Decommissioning	Deep-sea oil spill
Community level	Main concern	Physical disturbance of seabed and increase sedimentation		Discharge of drill muds and cuttings	Removal of structure	Exposure to high hydrocarbons and dispersant concentrations
	Impacts	Benthic habitat destruction.				Changes in benthic community abundance, age structure and trophic interactions.
		Diminished benthic community.		Benthic community diversity/abundance decrease.		
Individual Level	Main concern	Seismic survey and increase sedimentation	Increase sedimentation	Discharge of produced water	Release of chemical contaminants	Exposure to high hydrocarbons and dispersant concentrations
	Impacts	Larval development delay and malformations.				Health decline, hydrocarbon bioaccumulation.
		Changed respiration rate and reproduction capacities. Decreased growth rate.		Bioaccumulation of PAH and heavy metals.		Larval settlement disturbance. Hydrocarbon bioaccumulation.
		Paused filtration.				
Cellular & Molecular levels	Main concern	Discharge of drill muds and exposure to chemicals via release of produced water				Exposure to high hydrocarbons and dispersant concentrations
	Impacts	Decrease immune system function.				Decreased immune system function.
		Activation of MAPKs and cytochrome P450 pathways. Oxidative stress.				Activation of MAPKs and cytochrome P450 pathways. Oxydative stress.
		Decrease of lysosomal membrane stability.				

